	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/040,655	DARROW ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	William W. Moore	1652	

All Participants:

(1) _William W. Moore, Examiner_.

(2) _Ms. Linda S. Evans, Applicant's Counsel_.

Status of Application: _After-Final_

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: _9 July 2004_   **Time:** _4:30PM_

Type of Interview:
☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant   ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes   ☒ No
If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
None

Claims discussed:
30 and 32

Prior art documents discussed:
None

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

_____   _____
(Examiner/SPE Signature)   (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:
Authorization was requested of, and received from, Applicant's Counsel for an editorial examiner's amendment that removes two conjunctions from, and adds a semicolon to, claim 30, and that removes the conflicting generic term "hydrolases" from claim 30 and removes the conflicting generic term "colorants" from claim 32. .